

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

New claims and claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection. No new matter has been added.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4, 6-11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lundren in view of Friedman. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lundren in view of Friedman in further view of Applied Surface Technologies. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lundren in view of Friedman in further view of LaBianca. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In an effort to expedite the allowance of the current application, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 10. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

New claim 18 recites a method comprising: spraying carbon dioxide to remove particles on a surface of a reticle; cooling the reticle to a temperature below a sublimation temperature of carbon dioxide; forming a solid carbon dioxide layer on the surface of the cooled reticle to prevent particles from contacting the surface of the reticle; warming the reticle to sublime the solid carbon dioxide layer; and spraying gas to remove particles on the surface (for support, see, inter alia, pars. 10-20, FIG. 2A-2G). None of the references, whether considered singly or in combination, suggest the subject matter recited by claim 18. Lundgren describes an arrangement in which a fluid is frozen onto a substrate to act as a natural optical

filter to absorb certain wavelength bands of atmospheric radiation from reaching a detector of a sensor system (see, inter alia, Lundren abstract). Therefore, as Lundren maintains the fluid in a frozen state, there would be no motivation for the skilled artisan to subsequently sublime the fluid and to further spray gas on a surface to remove particles. Accordingly, claim 18 should be allowable.

New claim 19 recites a method for cleaning a surface of a reticle inside a lithography tool wherein the improvement comprises spraying the surface of the reticle with carbon dioxide (for support, see, inter alia, par. 19). As stated in section 11 of the office action, the art of record does not describe an arrangement as recited by claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 should be allowable.

New claim 20 recites a method comprising: placing a pellicle over a reticle; applying carbon dioxide to a surface of the pellicle; forming a solid carbon dioxide layer on the surface of the pellicle at a temperature below a sublimation temperature of carbon dioxide to prevent particles from contacting the surface of the pellicle; and removing the pellicle from the reticle (for support, see, inter alia, par. 20). None of the references suggest an arrangement in which a pellicle may be placed over a reticle, protected by a solid carbon dioxide layer, and subsequently removed from the pellicle. Accordingly, claim 20 should be allowable.

Allowability of Claim 10

It is agreed that the features of claim 10 recited in section 11 are not taught or suggested by the art of record, and that claim 10 is distinguished from the art of record for at least the stated reasons. Applicant does not concede that the stated reasons are the only grounds for patentability of the

claim 10, that the claim limitations excluded from section 11 are taught or suggested by the art of record, or that all of the limitations are necessary for patentability of the allowed claims or other claims directed to the disclosed subject matter.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Enclosed is a \$200 check for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

6/21/05



Scott C. Harris

Reg. No. 32,030

Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.

PTO Customer Number: 20985

12390 El Camino Real

San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: (858) 678-5070

Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10514755.doc